



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Jesus was inspired by the Spirit. Prophecy (Deut. 18:15-19) declares that this extends to his words. Other passages (John 12:49, 50; 17:8) prove it. So also in the Revelation, his messages to the churches are inspired by the Spirit. If he needed verbal inspiration, surely the New Testament writers needed it. The testimony of the Scriptures, then, is that the Spirit determined their form and language as well as the ideas. The rejection of the doctrine that the Scriptures are the offspring of an inspiration which determined the language employed by the sacred writers involves, logically, the rejection of the Bible as the word of God.

A presentation of the theory of verbal inspiration which is certainly unqualified and vigorous. The adherents of other views would not accept the characterization of their theories which is here given. This argument, as well as those of other schools, is weak in its failure to bring forward a reasonable induction of Scripture material—not isolated texts—in support of its claims.

The Babylonian Flood-Legend and the Hebrew Record of the Deluge.*

—Two Babylonian accounts of a flood have reached us; one discovered by George Smith on the cuneiform tablets, another written by Berosus, a priest of Babylon, and preserved in Eusebius. Both relate to the same event. (1) What is the relation of the subject-matter of the cuneiform account to the deluge recorded in Genesis? A comparison of the two reveals (a) the theme of the two accounts is the same; (b) the Hebrew narrative, at least as a whole, has not been derived from the cuneiform; the accounts are independent *save in their common origin*. They are variant versions, differing in the episode of the birds as to number, kind and actions, in the number of people in the ark, and especially in the polytheistic coloring of the cuneiform as over against the monotheism of the Hebrew. They are two independently transmitted traditions. (2) What is the date of the cuneiform? Even in the present form it belongs to a period very much earlier than the seventh century B. C. (3) What is the character of this cuneiform story? (a) In its present form it comes from Sumir-Accad; (b) it is an epic, not mythical but historical. (4) What light does it throw on the related Hebrew narrative? (a) It testifies that the Hebrew account came not by direct revelation but by tradition. Probably it was brought by Abraham to Canaan. It was used as a tradition by Moses, edited by him; as such it is historically accurate. (b) The testimony of the cuneiform account is in opposition to the theory that the Hebrew contains two interwoven accounts of the deluge. It is probable that the old traditions current in Israel were gathered up into this one account, not parcelled out among a variety of writers. In the very points in which the critics see diversity, there is seen similar diversity in the cuneiform story. This fact weakens the evidence for two contradictory accounts in the Hebrew. (c) The exegetical help afforded by the cuneiform story is slight. The land Nitsir, there mentioned as the landing-place of the ark, is near the district called Urtû. This suggests a similarity with Ararat (Urtu).

A thoughtful and scholarly discussion of this important and fascinating subject.

* By Prof. John D. Davis, Ph.D., in *The Presbyterian Review*, July, 1889, pp. 415-431.